ERIC Document Resume	See Instruction Sheet	DATE OF RESUME	DATE RECEIVED

A. PUBLICATION DATA

1. ERIC NUMBER	2. ORIGINATOR CONTROL NO(S).	3. IDENTIFICATION NO.	DO NOT WRITE IN SPACE BELOW
ED002616	N.A.	N.A.	

4. AUTHOR(S): N.A.

5. TITLE OF DOCUMENT ABSTRACTED:
Report of the National Workshop on the Education of Migrant Children St. Louis, Missouri

6. PUBLICATION TITLE: N.A.

7. EDITOR(S): N.A.

8. PLACE OF ORIGIN
The National Committee
ORG. on the Education of
ST. Migrant Children
145 East 32nd St.
CITY, STATE New York, New York
TELE. EXT.
INST/LOC CODE

9. PUBLISHER OR SOURCE The National Committee on the Education of Migrant Children 145 East 32nd Street, New York, New York

10. VOL.	11. PAGES	12. MO./YR.	13. TOTAL PP.
N.A.	N.A.	3/64	48

MICROFILM COPY AVAILABLE YES ☒ NO ☐

COPYRIGHT GRANTED YES ☐ NO ☒

COPYRIGHT RELEASE FILED YES ☐ NO ☐

TYPE OF REPORT
PROPOSAL ☐
IN-PROGRESS ☐
FINAL ☒
FOLLOW-UP ☐

OTHER ERIC REFERENCES:

ERIC SATELLITE CODE

B. INDEXING DATA

14. SUBJECT AREA

15. TYPE OF ENDEAVOR: Report

16. INDEXING TERMS (6-12)

migrant education	parent education	administration		
methodology	curriculum	school programs		
migrant children	health			
teachers of migrants	community relations			

17. ABSTRACT (MAX. 250 WORDS)

Educators from state departments of education faced with problems of education for migrant children met at the National Workshop on the Education of Migrant Children to share experiences and suggestions.

A major concern was to evaluate existing programs and to seek ways of relating these separate programs to the total educational experience of the child as he moves from state to state. Workshop members outlined, as a suggested guide to those States planning education programs for migrant children, the type of program which they considered essential if the educational needs of migrant children are to be adequately met. Committee reports covered the following basic areas of concern: fundamental principles acceptable in creating educational opportunities for migratory children; curriculum goals, content, and methods; the teacher of migrant children; parent education; the organization and administration of migrant school programs; responsibility for leadership; and community relations.

Concern was expressed that the education of migrant children was a job that could not be accomplished by the educator alone. It involved to a great degree the acceptance, by the community, of the idea that migrant children are as important as any other children and that because of their deprivation there is an added responsibility to see that they have an opportunity to become useful and productive citizens.

One of the barriers to providing education for migrant children was that of relating education to the traditional time pattern. Educators should be flexible in their thinking and creative in their planning in order to develop an effective educational program independent of these traditional time patterns. Care should be taken that any new patterns which are developed do not result in the further segregation of migrant children.

ERIC No.	18. SOURCE OF ABSTRACT		
	C. FUNDING DATA		
	19. SUPPORTING ORGANIZATION	20. DIVISION OR DEPT.	21. CONTRACT NO. / PROJECT NO.
		22. TOTAL COST OF PROJECT	
		23. DURATION OF PROJECT	U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare Office of Education

ERIC Form 1

ED002616

REPORT

OF

THE NATIONAL WORKSHOP

ON

THE EDUCATION OF MIGRANT CHILDREN

ST. LOUIS, MISSOURI

MAY 11 - 13, 1964

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE
Office of Education

This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated do not necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

THE CENTER FOR CULTURAL STUDIES
Adams State College of Colorado
Alamosa

The National Committee on the
Education of Migrant Children
145 East 32nd Street
New York, N.Y. 10016

J0603

ED002616

- C O N T E N T S -

	Page
FOREWORD	4
THE PROGRAM	6
SHIRLEY E. GREENE:	
Current Social and Economic Changes and Their Implications for Migrant Labor	9
CASSANDRA STOCKBURGER:	
The Status of Migrant Children's Education in the United States	11
REPORTS FROM WORK GROUPS:	
Foundational Principles Acceptable in Creating Educational Opportunities for Migratory Children	14
Curriculum for Migrant Children - Its Goals, Methods and Content	17
The Teacher of Migrant Children	19
Parent Education	21
The Organization and Administration of Migrant School Programs	22
Responsibility for Leadership	25
Community Relations	26
PANEL:	
Coordination of Community Services and Migrant School Programs	27

NATIONAL COMMITTEE ON THE EDUCATION OF MIGRANT CHILDREN
145 East 32nd Street, New York, N.Y. 10016

RESOURCES:

The United States Office of Education 31

Legislation 32

RECOMMENDATIONS 33

SUMMARY 34

REPORTS FROM THE STATES 36

APPENDICES:

Workshop Participants

Colorado Status Record

Texas School Record

Directory of Staff of
State Departments of Education Responsible
for Migrant Children's Education

THE CENTER FOR CULTURAL STUDIES
Adams State College of Colorado
Alamosa

FOREWORD

The National Workshop on the Education of Migrant Children was planned by the National Committee on the Education of Migrant Children at the request of the migrant education staffs of several state departments of education. They believed there would be real value in bringing together those educators who hold similar positions in other states to share experiences and plan for workable interstate programs.

Invitations to the workshop were issued to representatives of state departments of education, a selected group of other educators with experience in migrant education and consultants from related public agency programs.

On the basis of an interest questionnaire sent to invitees it was determined that most states had three major concerns: (1) the basic content of an educational and methodology program which would meet the special needs of migrant children; (2) coordination of the various community services available to migrants with the school program; and (3) resources presently and potentially available to the states for migrant education either through the United States Office of Education or through federal and state legislated programs.

The workshop was planned to give maximum attention to informal sharing of experiences and information and for interstate planning. This report, except for the workgroup reports, will attempt only to summarize the speeches, the panel presentations and the discussions.

Prior to the workshop 12 states indicated they would send representatives. However three, California, Indiana and Kansas, later found they were unable to do so. Those states which did participate were Colorado, Illinois, Missouri, New Jersey, New York, North Dakota, Pennsylvania and Washington. Some of the participating states are among those most experienced in developing programs for migrant children and represent a wide geographical area as well as experience with school programs for all the ethnic and racial groups found in the migrant streams.

A major concern of the workshop was to evaluate existing programs and seek ways of relating these separate programs to the total educational experience of the child as he moves from state to state. Working in small groups the workshop members outlined, as a suggested guide to those states planning education programs for migrant children, the type of program which they considered essential if the educational needs of migrant children are to be adequately met. The workgroups' reports cover seven basic areas

of concern: (1) Fundamental Principles Acceptable in Creating Educational Opportunities for Migratory Children; (2) Curriculum-Its Goals, Content and Methods; (3) The Teacher of Migrant Children; (4) Parent Education; (5) The Organization and Administration of Migrant School Programs; (6) Responsibility for Leadership; and (7) Community Relations.

The workshop also made several recommendations as to the next steps needed to promote the cause of migrant education in the United States. The National Committee on the Education of Migrant Children was asked to take the initiative in implementing these recommendations.

The workshop provided an opportunity for an exchange of experience and information between representatives of states who for the most part are already deeply involved in migrant education. This report is, in effect, a pooling of what this experience has taught them about meeting the educational needs of migrant children. It should serve as a source of inspiration and a guide to all those who are responsible for the education of these our nation's most educationally deprived youngsters.

Cassandra Stockburger
Director
National Committee on the
Education of Migrant Children

PROGRAM

NATIONAL WORKSHOP ON THE EDUCATION OF MIGRANT CHILDREN

May 11-13, 1964

Deville Motor Hotel, St. Louis, Mo.

Monday, May 11

2:00 - 5:00 P.M. **Opening Session**

Chairman: Mr. Eli E. Cohen, Exec. Sec'y.
National Child Labor Committee

Greetings from the Metropolitan Youth Commission of St. Louis: Mr. Sam Marcus

"Current Social and Economic Changes and Their Implications for the Future of Migrant Labor"
Dr. Shirley E. Greene, Exec. Sec'y.
Town and Country Church, United Church of Christ

The Status of Migrant Children's Education in the United States
Miss Cassandra Stockburger, Director
NCEMC

Reports on Selected State Programs

Tuesday, May 12

9:00 - 12:00 A.M. Work Session: Evaluation and Comparison of Existing Programs for Migrant Education; in action, on-going research, resources for

1:30 - 4:30 P.M. Work Session: Continuation
State and Interstate Planning

8:00 - 10:00 P.M. Work Session: Continuation
State Programs-Interstate Relationships

Wednesday, May 13

9:00 - 12:00 A.M. **Panel Discussion: Coordination of Community Services and Migrant School Programs**

Panel Members:

Mr. Thomas Roberson, Health Education Consultant, Migrant Health Branch, U.S. Dep't. of Health, Education and Welfare

Miss Mary Beth Brinegar, Child Care Consultant, Missouri Dep't. of Public Welfare

Mr. George W. Davis, Manpower Utilization Advisor, Division of Vocational and Technical Education, U.S. Office of Education

Mr. Laurence Houstoun, U.S. Dep't. of Labor, Consultant to Task Force on Poverty

Discussion

1:30 - 4:00 P.M. **Closing Session**

Federal Resources Available to States for Migrant Education

Mr. Ralph J. Becker, Director,
Division of State Grants, Bureau of
Educational Assistance Programs,
U.S. Office of Education

Discussion

State Legislation for Migrant Education

Mr. Roy McCanne, Consultant,
Migratory Education, Colorado State
Department of Education

Mr. Jack McIntosh, Coordinator, School
Programs for Children of Migrant Parents,
Texas Education Agency

Discussion

Evaluation and Summary.....Mr. Cohen

Current Social and Economic Changes and Their Implications for Migrant Labor

Shirley E. Greene
Secretary of Town and Country Church
United Church of Christ

Migrants are the children of misfortune. They are the rejects of other segments of the population. However, when we describe them in this manner we must do it sympathetically.

Contrary to what is often thought, there is much movement in and out of the migrant stream. It is such an undesirable occupation that the turnover of workers is quite high. Those who enter the stream have the least education and the fewest skills. They frequently have a language problem as well. Many in recent years have been forced out of resident farm jobs by the mechanization of the jobs previously requiring hand labor.

The migrant is further handicapped by the lack of stable employment. Poor planning for the utilization of labor by the growers contributes to irregular employment. In order to have assurance of an adequate labor supply when he needs it, the employer may overestimate his labor needs. This poor planning for the utilization of labor by the employer, along with the seasonal nature of the crops and unpredictable weather conditions, contributes to the unstable employment pattern of migrant labor.

This lack of stable employment coupled with low wages in many instances adds up to an annual wage of no more than $1,000. Even if you add to this equal earnings of a wife and older children, the family's annual income would barely rise above the poverty line.

Other problems faced by the migrant are poor housing and rank discrimination against agriculture workers in protective legislation. Organized labor has repeatedly sold out agricultural workers in order to get their bills through the Congress. Local and state residency laws are a further disability for migrants.

The findings of the study reported in The Education of Migrant Children[1], although published in 1954, still seems to have validity. This study showed that:

1. Migrants have the lowest level of education.
2. If a migrant child goes beyond the fourth grade, he is already ahead of all the school experience of his parents.
3. Parents place a genuine value on education.
4. Retardation has already begun by the second grade providing a fertile field for dropouts - many at an illegal age.

There is no doubt that the schools face a problem when migrant children come into the community. The school administrator must find rooms and teachers. His appeals to the community bring no response for migrants. There is little incentive for enforcement of school attendance laws because of community attitudes and the erratic nature of their attendance. The teacher also faces a problem of placement when the child comes to the classroom. Migrant children have few if any records of previous school experiences.

There seems to be no real solution to the education of migrant children except to eliminate their migrancy. Nevertheless we must continue to work at finding solutions.

The effect of the mechanization of agriculture during the past few years is being felt by migrant labor. Many jobs are no longer available, particularly in the cotton areas. As mechanization accelerates it reduces the need for seasonal farm labor. However the elimination of the importation of Mexican nationals under P.L. 78, scheduled to end in December of this year, may offset this. By providing more jobs for domestic migrants it may result in an increase in the movement of migrant families.

If the Poverty Program is to be serious about the elimination of poverty, it must eventually consider migrants.

Migrant labor is a long time problem. Some progress has been made over the years, but there is still a long way to go.

---

1 The Education of Migrant Children, Shirley E. Greene, Department of Rural Education, National Education Association, Washington, D.C., 1954.

THE STATUS OF MIGRANT CHILDREN'S EDUCATION IN THE UNITED STATES

Cassandra Stockburger
Director
National Committee on the Education of Migrant Children

The most reliable estimates available to us show that there are as many as 150,000 migrant children under age 14 who travel with their parents. In addition to this number, perhaps 75,000 in the 14-17 year old group are counted as workers in the domestic migrant work force. A similar number are believed to remain at home base with relatives or friends while one or both parents travel.[1]

Over the past year as we have tried to piece together a picture of the fragmented education offered to and received by only a few of these migrant children, we have found that the national picture as a whole is not a bright one. There is developing here and there, however, new legislation, new programs and new interest which give us reason to hope that there will be a continuing improvement of the opportunities for education.

Most of you received from us last fall an interpretative report of our nationwide survey on the education of migrant children. We were gratified by the response to our questionnaire but disappointed that so little information was available either from education sources or other interested agencies. Replies were received from a total of 44 states. Thirty-seven state departments of education responded to the questionnaire. However, 12 of these states reported they had no migrant problem, largely because the children came only during the summer vacation period. Seven states for various reasons did not complete the questionnaire. Some indicated they had no programs or no known programs even though they rank high in the number of migrants coming into their state.

We found that only three or four of the states replying were able to give us reasonably complete records of migrant school attendance during the regular school term. Almost none of the replies even attempted to estimate the number of children coming into their state. At least one, it must be noted, as a matter of policy, does not distinguish migrant children in their records.

Twenty-two states indicated that migrant children could enroll in the regular terms. Only seven states, however, reported any knowledge of special efforts to enroll migrant children in the regular term. Eighteen states provided summer schools in one or more of the three years 1960-1962. In nine of these states the summer schools were operated by private agencies. These schools enrolled from 13 children in one state to no more than 150 in another. Two were for pre-school age children only. Of the nine

states having schools operated by the state or local education agencies, two were discontinued in 1962 and one in 1963 for lack of funds.

Neither enrollment nor average daily attendance figures can give us the full image of the type of education the migrant child receives when he does enroll in school. It is the curriculum content, the preparation of the teachers and the pre-school experiences of the child which are crucial in determining the quality of education he receives. There are some encouraging developments in all of these areas. Three or four states have prepared curriculum guides for migrant children. Colorado's Adams State College under the direction of Dr. Alfred M. Potts, 2d provides summer workshops for teachers of migrant children. There is a trend toward relating day-care centers to school programs although to date the pre-school programs for migrant children have been largely outside the responsibility of education.

The responses to the section in the questionnaire on problems and needs reveal a story of frustration, lack of information and to some degree a tendency to assign responsibility for problems to others - to the home base area, to a lack of support from communities or legislatures. In general it was found that most of the problems cited were related to mobility, pupil or family attitudes, lack of community concern or lack of finances, classrooms and teachers. All of this adds up to the difficult problem faced by school administrators and teachers when they attempt to fit the temporary and disadvantaged child into the ordinary classroom.

This then is the problem we are here to consider. What can be done to meet the educational needs of some 150,000 school-age migrant children who travel with their parents? They move in and out of at least 47 states with more than 20 reporting substantial numbers. The pattern of movement is such that even most non-home base states have migrant children for a few weeks at the end and at the beginning of regular school terms as well as for several weeks during the summer.

There are indications that the patterns of migration are changing somewhat. With the increase in mechanization, movement may be more frequent and work stops of shorter duration. Yet, somehow, a way must be found to get and keep the migrant child in school. The solution may lie in the not so simple matter of deciding who carries the responsibility and then seeing to it that it is carried out.

The time is past when responsibility may be dropped at the state line. This is a national and an interstate problem. It can be solved only by working out solutions together.

---

[1] Children in Migrant Families, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Washington, 1961, p. 7.

REPORTS FROM WORK GROUPS

FOUNDATIONAL PRINCIPLES ACCEPTABLE IN CREATING EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES FOR MIGRATORY CHILDREN

In earlier periods of our history the American individual with minimally developed skills usually could find a place for performance in the society. The changed complexity of the society makes far greater demands upon the individual in this contemporary period. Preparation for successful participation must necessarily be more complete.

Creating ability for flexibility to enable adaptation to changing environmental, technological, and social circumstances can be a reasonable means to individual competency. The skills developed in the schooling process should include - with the essential speaking, writing, reading skills- the skill to think independently upon basis of appropriate knowledges that are either accepted by or new to the society.

The society in which an individual lives is a composite created by the individuals who compose it. A firmly accepted principle of the American system is the creation of competence within the individual that both the individual and his fellows will benefit in a better society. The resultant acceptance is that all children should receive the benefits of education. Thus, permissive exclusion of the migrant child from educational process is denied.

An acceptance of the fact that migrant children do need certain additional emphasis in their formal education preparation suggests consideration of the following minimal bases for foundationing that education.

1. Providing educational opportunity for its children is a recognized and accepted responsibility of society. The condition of migrancy militates against the individual migrant child recognizing the values of education and being able to participate fully in the process of organized education. The school, in fulfilling its responsibility, must recognize the need to adapt its program, time schedules, etc., to the migrant child's circumstances. This responsibility contrasts with the school offering facility only when it can be fitted conveniently into traditional program and time schedules.

2. Response to the questions "Why acculturate?" or "Why more fully enculturate?" migrant children is imperative to establishing the source of decision in the education of these children.

Cultural groups, living in contiguous society, inevitably develop imbalances in relationships with the dominant culture. The fact that the economic structure is controlled chiefly by the dominant culture group is the major incentive for any type of minority group to master the ways to cultural rapport. This does not preclude the desirability of dual-culture competence by the lesser group. It is also suggested that minority-culture peoples of this society be aided to awareness of the possible weakness which may result from cultural proliferation in which too little competence is attained in any one culture; and, also, that they may have sufficient basis in understanding to participate in the decisions relevant to culture acceptance. There should be understanding of the fact that much of the American society's strength emanates from the pluralisms of its people.

3. Organized learning opportunity, such as the school creates, is one of society's major means for expansive development of the child in preparation for useful, productive, and resourceful citizenship. The creation and implementation of the schooling opportunity should be accepted as a societal responsibility.

4. The educational experience should be planned to meet the true, known needs of the child. This suggests full consideration of the biosociopsychological and the cultural considerations which have influence from both within and without the child.

5. The public school educational opportunity should allow for learning from whatever base of beginning the child may enter it. Recognition of the affirmative and the negative learnings and the voids in his learning acquired from particular environmental experiencing must be recognized.

The Goals for American Education are as equally important to the migrant child as they are to all other children. However, in the process for fulfilling the goals two important circumstances must be recognized:

a) The child starts the schooling experience from a different (lower) base than do many other children.

b) The familial and environmental learning situation of the migrant child which parallels the continuing school experience does not equate for this difference in the equalization of opportunity for development.

6. In migrant's education the goals which relate to creation of high value personal characteristics - as ethics, behavioral competencies and creation in the child of value acceptances - are particularly important and should be fulfilled by deliberately planned means in the educative process.

Reducing the rationale which supports the reasons for more specialized effort in educating the migrant child to minimal summary, it can be said:

Whether the migrant child is from a minority or other culture, he needs much additional culturation through schooling process because of the calibre of the environmental training to which he has been exposed.

The mandates for individual competence imposed by the society suggest that opportunity for development and expansion is essential for reaching each one's potential.

The indications of need for societal-participation competence suggest learning bodies of information and skills that have been worked out in the past. However, that which is taught must not be thought of as static knowledge. The education process should aim to aid the migrant child toward ability and understanding to perform according to his fully recognized life needs.

Submitted by: Fausto S. Toscano
Alfred M. Potts, 2d

CURRICULUM FOR MIGRANT CHILDREN - ITS GOALS, METHODS AND CONTENT

1. The goal of education for migrant children is the same as for all children, namely, the growth of each individual to reach his full potential. However, due to the environment of the migrant child, special emphasis needs to be placed on certain objectives:

   a) Experiences should be provided that give extra help to the child in developing a realistic, non-restricted idea of his own self worth. The migrant child needs experiences that are broader than he gets in his ordinary life in order to gain the self-confidence and self-respect he needs to make his way among groups other than his own.

   b) The migrant child may not have received as much attention and care as he needs for emotional stability. In attempting to fulfill this need the school should show admiration for what the child does well. It should make special efforts to make the child feel welcome in the school and to feel as important as any other individual.

   c) Particular efforts need to be made to help the migrant child understand the value of education and want to attend school at every opportunity.

   d) Due to the low income and other disadvantaged conditions of migratory life, particular attention should be paid to health problems and health education. An effective health education experience should be provided for both parents and children. Guidance should be given in the areas of safety and accident prevention, nutrition and personal hygiene. Diagnostic and treatment clinics to provide medical and dental examinations and follow up treatment, immunizations, and identification and treatment of emotional problems should be available. The cooperation of health and other community agencies should be sought in carrying out as comprehensive a program as possible.

   e) When the migrant child is learning English as a second language, extra time, effort, materials and experiences should be provided. Much more than ordinary language arts competence is needed on the part of teachers in order to meet this objective. The teacher should have special competence in language learning methods. She should have knowledge and understanding of the culture of the migrant, techniques for assessing rapidly the readiness and achievement levels of pupils, techniques for individualizing

instruction, and a thorough understanding of the process of learning how to communicate.

f) Non-school agencies contributing to the school program, e.g., recreation agencies, should make their contributions consistent with the objectives of the goals for individual self-fulfillment.

g) The development of a sense of responsibility for one's actions should be given special emphasis. The values taught intentionally or subjectively by the school should be carefully thought out. The societal values of responsibility to others, respect for property and respect for work and achievement should not be compromised.

h) To the extent possible, each child should be led to analyze critically and objectively the issuesthat confront him. Migrant children have less experience than other children in problem solving and thought processes, while the changing and technical nature of modern life leads to an increased need for these skills.

2. The content of the curriculum and methods used to teach the content must remain flexible and must be adapted to the individual child. The most important need is for well prepared and experienced teachers who can implement the stated goals in meaningful ways.

3. Pre-school experiences are regarded as being particularly valuable to migrant children because their background does not provide many of the school readiness skills. In addition to providing readiness experiences and physical care of pre-school age children, pre-school programs can free older children from baby-sitting while the parents are at work, thus enabling the older children to attend school.

Submitted by: Tom Bogia
Thomas Roberson
Roy McCanne
George B. Inskip

THE TEACHER OF MIGRANT CHILDREN

All American children are entitled to education to the limits of their capabilities, both for their own individual development and success, and for the needs of our democratic society. The children of migrant workers have special problems in receiving the benefits which are available to them because of the frequent moves necessitated by their parents' employment.

Communities, states and the federal government, all have a mutual interest in providing the best teachers available to work with these children. These teachers should:

1. Be well trained, fully qualified and certified in the state in which they work.

2. Be experienced in teaching children who are educationally retarded.

3. Have special preparation at the college level to include:

   a) Skill in teaching English as a foreign or second language where other than English is spoken by the parents.

   b) Bilingual background where migrants speak other than English.

   c) Knowledge of the cultures and semantic deviants of the children.

   d) Courses in psychology and sociology with emphasis on the problems peculiar to deprived children.

   e) Knowledge of remedial procedures and programs.

Adequate coordination, direction, and finance must be provided from the federal level to supplement efforts of the states inasmuch as:

1. The problem extends beyond state lines.

2. The area of need is often limited to a local area in a state and is seasonal; state legislators are reluctant to pass legislation which is special or discriminatory in nature.

3. The home base state can best serve as the clearing house for records of attendance, education development, health and the mobility profile. This requires a fast joint effort by local schools, state agencies, and the federal agencies. Each should share in the financing and the coordination of such a program.

Selection of teachers should be based on the training and ability of candidates as noted and on their special interest in migrant children as well.

Submitted by: Dan C. LeRoy
Jack McIntosh
Warren M. Black

PARENT EDUCATION

A program of education in which the teacher is an integral part should be provided for adult migrants. This program should include the following:

1. Basic understanding of the value of education for their children in a rapidly changing society.

2. Basic education to enable parents of migrant children to become functionally literate.

3. Health education as related to their own health habits and practices as well as their effect on the education and well being of their children.

4. Professional counseling services to the parents by trained personnel when requested and needed.

5. Citizenship training pointed toward competent participation in a democratic society.

6. Basic economics and home managament techniques.

Submitted by: Dan C. LeRoy
Jack McIntosh
Warren M. Black

ORGANIZATION AND ADMINISTRATION OF MIGRANT SCHOOL PROGRAMS

STATE ORGANIZATION AND RESPONSIBILITY

A person in the state department of education should be responsible for supervision and administration of migrant education. He can operate best within the structure of the state school organization.

The duties of the state-level supervisor should include the following:

1. Visit and become personally familiar with the culture, values, educational status, and economic conditions of all migrants in the state.

2. Determine the arrival and departure patterns and the number of migrant children in all areas.

3. Develop standards and procedures for regulating migrant education programs.

4. Approve programs and allotments for individual districts participating in special support programs.

5. Organize and conduct in-service preparation for administrators and teachers.

6. Develop resource lists and materials for local school use.

7. Maintain close liaison with departments of health, welfare, and all other agencies concerned with migrant labor for improved coordination of activities.

8. Aid in the enforcement of state compulsory attendance laws.

9. Promote interstate and intrastate cooperative programs of pupil record transfer.

10. Disseminate information and take active leadership in promoting good public relations.

11. Evaluate continuously and make necessary recommendations and changes.

12. Prepare the reports essential for continuous program upgrading.

LOCAL ORGANIZATION

A qualified person who is sympathetic to the situation of migrant children should be assigned at the local level to organize and administer the migrant children's education program.

Among the duties of the local leader are the following:

1. Survey and evaluate the needs of migrant children who enter the local scene.

2. Procure qualified teachers who are sympathetic to and will understand the needs of migrants.

3. Organize program and develop class schedules.

4. Develop with teachers curriculum revisions, teaching methods and materials to improve the education process for migrants.

5. Communicate and cooperate with local individuals and organizations in order to provide services that are not available within the school.

6. Explain the educational program, and the value thereof, to parents of migrant children.

7. Provide for the enforcement of attendance laws.

8. Prepare required reports.

NEEDS OF PEOPLE -PHYSICAL FACILITIES

The school facilities should be adequate to meet the needs of the educational program. It is assumed that in all cases the physical plant facilities shall be the same as for the resident pupils.

RECORDS

It is of vital importance to maintain a continuing record of the migrant child's achievement. The following information should be made available to (1) the next school, (2) sent to the home base school of each child, and (3) a copy should be given to the family:

1. Health status of the child indicating hearing, sight, immunization, and other physical conditions

2. Reading level

3. Grade Placement

4. Age and date of birth

5. Oral language usage

6. General achievement if available - the most recent achievement

7. Social adjustment

8. Attendance record

FINANCE

Responsibility for financing summer school programs should be borne by federal, state, and local governments. However, this does not preclude financial aid from voluntary agencies.

TRANSPORTATION

Transportation for migrant children is essential, especially in cases where the school is not in close proximity to the migrants' housing. The regular school transportation system of the district should be used. Transportation should be provided for migrant children attending summer school on the same basis of need as in the regular term.

SPECIAL SERVICES

The school should provide the same services for migrant children as for the year round resident children such as library and health facilities, the school lunch and the milk programs. In addition such special services as required by the special needs of migrant children should be available.

One example of special need is testing for grade placement and for determining the potential of the child. Standardized I.Q. tests may not be of value. It is extremely important whatever instrument or method of evaluation is used that it measure what it was intended to evaluate.

Submitted by: Robert M. Ring
Margaret Brant
Werner H. Reuf
Dike A. Willoughby

RESPONSIBILITY FOR LEADERSHIP

In order to achieve an optimum program for the education of migrant children the leadership of the National Committee on the Education of Migrant Children is needed to function in the following ways:

1. As consultant

2. To collect and disseminate information to the public and to educators

3. To stimulate interest and action

Because of the nature of their work migrants must cross political boundaries for employment. Therefore, cooperation among the states is essential to the solution of migrant problems.

The federal legislation (S.521, S.522 & S.523) now before Congress is needed to aid states and local school districts in providing adequate education for migrant children. This legislation would supply financial aid and incentive for the development of broad programs of education and day care.

A National Advisory Council on Migrant Labor, established by an Act of Congress, would provide leadership to the state agencies and citizens' committees for the education and general welfare of migrant laborers and their children. The urgency of the migrants' plight makes immediate federal legislation and executive action necessary.

Legislation is needed in many states to expand migrant educational opportunities. Such legislation should place authority and responsibility within the State Department of Education. Any federal financial assistance should be supplementary to the state and local program responsibilities. The state should assume the major responsibility in providing, through local districts, for the regular and special education programs for migrants. However, local districts should be encouraged to assume increasing responsibility. Provisions should be made for cooperation between existing state agencies which have responsibility for migrants.

Submitted by: Doris Conklin
Cyrus H. Karraker

COMMUNITY RELATIONS

Many of the problems encountered in the education of migrant children are rooted in their limited societal experiences. For the most part migrants do not participate in the life of the community. Their low economic and social status plus their lack of permanent residence usually bars their seeking out, or their acceptance in, normal community activities. Ways must be found to bridge this gap and enable migrants to participate in the benefits of our society.

Migrants should never be related to as segregated groups even though they come to the community segregated. Every effort should be made to recognize their dignity and personal worth by bringing them as individuals into close relationship to the community. Both the migrant and the community will benefit from this inter-relationship. Some suggested ways of accomplishing this are:

1. Through efforts of civic organizations, the business community and the lay citizen to provide for recreational facilities and experiences.

2. Through the use of state employed social workers who would be available to enroll children in day care programs, to provide transportation to clinics and hospitals, to counsel on personal problems and to promote friendly association among community members and migrant families.

3. Through arranging guided tours or visits to placesof interest in the community.

4. Through the use of library and play mobiles.

Submitted by: Doris Conklin
Cyrus H. Karraker

PANEL: COORDINATION OF COMMUNITY SERVICES AND THE MIGRANT SCHOOL PROGRAM

Eli E. Cohen, Moderator

Thomas Roberson, U.S. Department of Health Education & Welfare
Mary Beth Brinegar, Missouri Department of Welfare
George W. Davis, U.S. Office of Education
Laurence Houstoun, Consultant to Task Force on Poverty

The purpose of this panel was to acquaint the Workshop with the services and resources available to migrants in the areas of Public Health, Day Care, Vocational Education and through the proposed Anti-Poverty Program and to discuss ways in which these services can be related to the migrant schools.

THE MIGRANT HEALTH ACT OF 1963

To date there are forty-one projects in twenty-three states and 209 counties under the provisions of the Migrant Health Act of 1963. This Act provides for most health services except in-patient service and building construction. Its operation is not on a matched formula basis but it does expect applicants to make some contribution. So far they have contributed about 40% of the total costs of these projects.

The broad goals and philosophy of the migrant health program may be described as:

1. Providing national leadership and serving as a focal point of migrant interest and activities in the Public Health Service.

2. Getting migrants included in community planning and services; not further isolated from community life.

3. Helping the migrant to help himself, to encourage self-respect, to build responsibility and to help establish constructive contacts between the migrant and the community.

4. Helping communities provide a setting in which migrants helping themselves can be realistically achieved.

The Migrant Health Act is a unique opportunity to provide health services for migrant children. The program staff welcomes every opportunity to sit down with educators and discuss ways of providing health services to migrant children in their schools.

DAY CARE SERVICES

No one service to children is more important than another. It

is important that all disciplines be coordinated. Public Welfare must work with health and education to provide the services needed.

Actually up to now day care has had little status with public agencies. Even yet, 98 percent of the day care centers in our country are commercially operated. It was during World War II when many mothers went to work that the need for day care centers first became apparent. Today there are nine million mothers who are working; more than during the war period. There are five and one-half million children who are left to look after themselves.

Standards for day care have been slow in developing. The first were developed by the Child Welfare League. Some states have now assumed responsibility for the development and supervision of these centers.

The staff of day care centers should be well trained. The director should be an educator and the staff should be trained in early childhood education. For migrant children the day care center should be a pre-school learning experience. Because of their disadvantaged background, the day care centers should become to a greater degree more than a place for the care and protection of the children.

<u>There are now federal funds available to state departments of welfare which can be used for the children of working mothers, including migrants</u>. The provisions of this program specify that the departments of health, education and welfare must work together in establishing day care programs which use these funds. Private agencies may secure these funds through the state welfare department for the operation of day care centers which may include migrant children.

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

Amendments to the Smith Hughes and the George Bardon Acts have loosened regulations governing these two vocational education programs. For example, in agriculture it is no longer mandatory that a student carry out a supervised project although he may do so. In home economics it is now required that 10% of the programs be devoted to study of gainful employment such as for restaurant cooks. The remainder can be used as previously for homemaker education alone. In the trades and industrial section of the Act courses cover such fields as cosmetology and short order cooks. In the distributive education section any person 14 years and up may enroll full or part-time in skilled or semi-skilled areas.

Relating the present vocational education provisions to migrants may not be easy since 90% of the funds are allocated on a <u>state</u> basis. The other 10% are placed by the Commissioner according to

his priorities. It would seem that to serve migrants best a method for interstate cooperation would be the crucial problem to solve.

Some of the programs submitted under the Vocational Education Act of 1963 have not been approved as yet because the request for supplemental funds for 1964 was not granted. However since projects are approved on the basis of available funds, states should go ahead and submit projects. The public frequently does not understand that the passage of a bill with an authorization for funds does not permit their allocation. Therefore a considerable delay may be experienced before allocations are made.

In some instances problems have developed in the administration of vocational education programs because of local labels or restrictions. In one place, for example, a homemaking course was set-up and made available to welfare recipients only. When this fact became generally known many of the class dropped out. There is nothing, however, in the Vocational Education Act which would prohibit its programs being offered to all.

THE ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY ACT of 1964 (PROPOSED)

The so-called Anti-Poverty Bill now under consideration by Congress provides the framework for effective action in behalf of migrant labor. Various sections of the bill would offer help to migrants. The Job Corpswould offer upward mobility opportunities for rural youth. The Work-Training section, which it is hoped will be school-based, will offer counseling and an opportunity to work while staying in school. It should be of real value to the school drop-out.

The Volunteersfor America or the domestic peace corps will provide staff for language teaching, day care, training and remedial programs. This section of the bill offers opportunity for development and use of indigenous leadership. Those who bear the label of the poor can contribute both in planning and in leadership.

In the Community Action Program sufficient technical assistance will be available to allow all communities regardless of their local resources to start off on an even foot. This program is designed as a united effort of all community agencies and services.

Since migrants in many instances are not considered a part of the community, there may be a problem in getting the home base community to include them in their community action programs. Migrants may benefit most through funds provided for research and demonstration.

Perhaps one of the most feasible programs for migrants at the present time is the Manpower Development and Training Act. Since these funds are available on both a state and an interstate basis, every migrant youth between the ages of 16 and 21 is eligible for 72 weeks of basic education and skill training plus an allowance. Twenty-five percent of MDTA funds have been designated for disadvantaged youth.

There is need for more MDTA programs to be organized. Some communities may need to import their leadership. The home base area, a labor surplus area, is now better able to participate since the base for the labor area has been broadened. Provisions have also been made for loans to enable relocation of trained workers to an available job area.

RESOURCES OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICE OF EDUCATION AVAILABLE TO THE STATES FOR MIGRANT EDUCATION

Ralph J. Becker
Director
Division of State Grants, U.S. Office of Education

The United States Office of Education is an operating agency of the United States Department of Health, Education and Welfare. It plays a role in the total national education picture. The purpose of this office is to:

1. Cooperate with local and state education agencies and the community to improve the quality and the quantity of education programs

2. Administer legislation passed by Congress

3. Supply information to the nation and to all concerned with the status of education, numbers, cost, etc.

Altogether the various departments of the United States Government spend $2,200,000,000 for education of which only about one-third is spent by the Office of Education. The Department of Agriculture alone spends more than the Office of Education. The Defense Department spends almost as much.

There are no specific programs in the Office of Education for migrant education. However the fourteen programs which give funding assistance to the states could be applied to individual migrant children. These programs are: the deaf, international education, library services, the Manpower Development and Training Act, land grant, National Defense Education Act, mental retardation, retraining, school assistance to impacted areas, science clubs, educational television, vocational and technical education and the handicapped.

The Office recognizes the problems of migrant children and the need for federal programs in migrant education. Mr. George E. Haney is the staff specialist in the education of migrant children. He has prepared three articles for publication. They are: Selected State Programs, Questions and Answers on Migrant Education and Trends in Migrant Education. Mr. Haney has planned a conference on school records for May 25 and 26 to consider a possible interstate record system for the states on the East coast. If it proves successful additional meetings are planned. Mr. Haney is also available to the states for consultation.

A third possible resource area is that of the Department of Cooperative Research which operates under P.S.531. This department has funds available for research and demonstration projects in approved areas. Only state education agencies and colleges are eligible for grants. In fiscal 1963 the department spent $12,500,000.

The Office of Education is also interested in vocational education and retraining opportunities for migrants.

LEGISLATION

The purpose of this discussion was to get before the group the experiences of states in developing migrant legislation for school programs or in developing migrant school services under existing school legislation.

On the basis of the discussion it is evident that the education of migrant children is provided in the several states on the basis of very diverse legislation. Some states as New York and Colorado have specific migrant school laws. Others such as California and Texas operate programs on the basis of existing laws for special programs or the regular school laws. An example of this is the Texas pre-school program for non-English speaking children which includes migrants. The special Texas migrant school programs this past season required no special legislation but were operated under the regular minimum foundation program. Still another example cited by Texas is their school drop-out program planned to give special attention to migrants. This program was instituted by an executive order of the Governor.

Only a few states have passed specific legislation for migrant education. For the most part these have been non-home base areas. This legislation varies greatly in its provisions. For example, the New Jersey law simply states that insofar as possible the Migrant Labor Bureau with the assistance of the Department of Education will provide education for migrant children. The funds are appropriated by the state. The regular school laws cover the regular school term.

On the other hand the New York and Colorado laws are quite specific. In New York all expenses are paid by the state to the school district which provides an approved summer school for migrant children. It defines migrant children as "Children of school age temporarily located in the state, whose parents are seasonally employed by canners, growers or processors of food and foodstuffs." The law also spells out the rate of reimbursement of the school district based on pupil enrollment.

The Colorado law is known as the Migrant Children Educational Act and was enacted in 1961. This Act provides for reimbursement to school districts which provide for the education of migrant children either in summer schools or in the regular school term. Applications must be approved by the State Board of Education. The Act defines a migrant child as "A child of school age who is in the custody of migrant agricultural workers whether or not they are

his parents". Migrant agricultural workers are defined as "An individual engaged in agricultural labor in this state who is residing in a school district which is not his domicile during the performance of such agricultural labor". The Act further specifies formulas for classroom and supervisory units.

Experience of the states having migrant education legislation has shown that it is very important to clearly define the migrant child. Questions frequently arise as to the eligibility of children of other itinerants such as race track followers and lumbermen.

It was suggested that any state contemplating legislation of this type should consult with those who have had experience in this field. The National Committee can provide information on existing legislation.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The National Committee was requested to take the initiative in the implementation of the following recommendations:

1. As a follow-up of this National Workshop plans should be made for:

   a. A series of regional meetings of educators to discuss and plan for migrant education on an interstate basis.

   b. An extended national workshop on the education of migrants to be held in 1965. It would concentrate on the implementation of program.

   c. A conference of state school officers and/or a meeting of regional school administrators.

2. Consideration should be given to the possibility of expanding the National Committee to become a membership organization of educators concerned with migrant education.

3. Brief state reports should be sent periodically to the NCEMC Office which would serve as a clearing house and distribute them to all other states.

4. Assistance should be made available through the NCEMC office to those states planning legislation on migrant education by providing information on existing laws and experienced personnel in other states who could serve as consultants.

5. A communication should be sent to the U.S. Office of Education stating the degree of urgency felt by the states for national action in this area. Arrangements should be made for state representatives to confer with the Commissioner of Education

in regard to the role of the U.S. Office of Education which was outlined by the workshop as one of:

1. Collecting and disseminating periodic reports on <u>current</u> migrant education programs and progress.

2. Sponsoring regional meetings to further interstate cooperation.

3. Supporting <u>action</u> and <u>developmental</u> <u>research</u>.

4. Directing attention to the needs of the migrant segment of the population for functional literacy skills and understandings.

5. Developing curriculum materials.

6. Giving leadership to the acceptance of responsibility and the development of program implementation.

7. Providing adequate staff to get the job done.

SUMMARY

An abundance of information, both verbal and printed, was exchanged during this workshop. New understandings were gained of the problems faced by all states and by the home base states in particular.

Concern was repeatedly expressed that the education of migrant children is a job which cannot be accomplished by the educator alone. It involves to a great degree the acceptance by the community of the idea that migrant children are as important as any other children and that perhaps because of their deprivation there is an added responsibility to see that they have an opportunity to become useful and productive citizens.

It was recognized that one of the barriers to providing education for migrant children is that of relating education to the traditional time pattern. Experience has shown that educators must be flexible in their thinking and creative in their planning in order to develop an effective educational program independent of these traditional time patterns. Care must be taken that any new patterns which are developed do not result in the further segregation of migrant children.

The workshop was able to identify a number of areas of need and to outline a comprehensive program. However, a number of important questions which were raised in the discussions remained unanswered. Among these were:

1. What are the special needs of migrant children over and above those of other children?

2. What is an effective testing and evaluation program for these children since experience has shown that those testing devices normally used are not valid when used with the disadvantaged?

3. How can special education for disadvantaged groups be provided without risking the label of segregation?

4. For what are we educating and training the disadvantaged?

The cooperative efforts of all will be needed to build upon the accomplishments of this workshop and to continue to implement the program. There is a role for all: the state departments of education to develop school programs; the educational institutions to provide facilities for research and teacher training; the U.S. Office of Education to provide national leadership, resources and interstate coordination of programs and the National Committee to continue to provide information and to stimulate interest and acceptance.

REPORTS FROM THE STATES

COLORADO

Under special legislation for migrant education, Colorado operates 20 or 21 summer schools in 11 school districts enrolling 796 children. During the regular school term 2,300 migrant children are enrolled.

The summer schools operate for about seven weeks. Each class is limited to 15 to 20 children. The children are handled on an individual and a special grouping basis within each classroom. The curriculum stresses the 3 R's in a remedial program. No special texts are used.

A hot lunch program is provided. Lunches cost 10 cents. If the parents are unable to pay, the state reimburses the school.

In the regular school term the usual report cards are used. In the summer schools a special report is made. Status reports are sent to the home base school districts. Colorado believes that the use of records helps the child and the parents develop some idea of the progress made and of individual responsibility.

ILLINOIS

The state has now placed the responsibility for migrant education within the State Department of Education. A committee is working on a guide to the organization and administration of migrant school programs.

MISSOURI

Missouri is a home base area for migrants who are largely concentrated in the Southeastern part of the state. There are no special migrant education laws but under minimum foundation provisions the state can pay up to $2,800 additional aid for each teacher in a special education room in the public schools. Programs are being changed to provide employment opportunities and assistance in cooperation with Vocational Rehabilitation. In 1963-64, 110 special education teachers at the elementary level and 39 teachers above the elementary level were employed in 15 Southeast Missouri counties. One of the problems in the migrant areas is the shifting of the population to larger towns leaving the more rural small school districts hard pressed to provide adequately for the remaining residents.

NEW JERSEY

Reports indicate that about 2,000 migrants come into New Jersey. They bring with them 976 children of school age. During the past summer (1963), 340 children were enrolled in four schools operated for five weeks in July and August by the State Department of Education. Nursery facilities were provided for the pre-school children.

Among the special services provided were a nurse in each school, dental and medical clinics, transportation and a hot lunch program.

All of the teachers are fully certified. Students from the state colleges assist with the nursery schools.

An attempt was made to coordinate the summer school programs with the children's regular school experience in Florida by the use of the same textbooks as those used in the Florida schools.

NEW YORK

A migrant education law was passed in New York State ten years ago. It provides for all expenses of the migrant schools. In 1963, 10 summer schools were operated with a total enrollment of 355 children. Four of the schools included related day care facilities. The average cost per pupil for the summer schools is $768 as compared to $706 for the regular term.

A goal of 18 schools with a budget of $80,000 has been set for the summer of 1964.

NORTH DAKOTA

The state has 125 migrant children in seven counties. A special school for 40 children is planned for the summer of 1964. Heretofore most of the special schools have been privately operated by the Catholic Church. The real problem in North Dakota is the enrollment of children for a short time both in the spring and the fall terms.

PENNSYLVANIA

All children coming into Pennsylvania are expected to enroll in school while in the state. The school laws provide reimbursement to the school district of $1.00 a day for each pupil up to 40 days of enrollment. The greatest problem is the children's lack of school records. Two summer schools are planned in 1964. An estimated 376 school age migrant children come into the state.

TEXAS

Believing that any "nine-month period does not indicate the beginning and the ending of a school experience" Texas tried a unique experiment in five districts during the 1963-'64 school year. In those districts migrant children were able to enroll on a voluntary basis in special classes for a six-month period beginning in November when most of the migrants return to their home base. By attending eight hours each day and most holidays, they were able to complete the required number of school hours for a full term. About 3,000 children were enrolled in these classes which employed 200 fully certified degree teachers. All of the basic texts used in the state were made available to these classes as well as a specially prepared guide.

The schools are presently in a process of evaluation. Results of extensive pre and post-testing, reading checks, attendance records, and an opinionnaire sent to school administrators, teachers, visitors and consultants will form the basis for the evaluation.

Special report cards are being issued to the children who attend these schools.

It is hoped that these special schools will enable the migrant child to successfully re-enter the main stream of the educational system.

WASHINGTON

Large numbers of migrants in Washington come from Crystal City, Tex. They arrive in mid-March and remain until mid-October. Two years ago the state operated one summer school. However the legislature did not renew the appropriation.

The State Department of Education received requests for 10 schools in 1964 but for lack of funds cannot provide them.

However, private funds will provide for two summer schools. They will make use of public school buildings. One will serve Canadian Indian children and will include a day care center. The other will be for Spanish-speaking children. Transportation will be provided. Unfortunately the hot lunch program is restricted to the regular school term.

A P P E N D I C E S

PARTICIPANTS

BECKER, Ralph J.	Director, Division of State Grants, Bureau of Educational Assistance Programs, U.S. Office of Education Washington, D.C.
BLACK, Warren	General Supervisor, State Dep't. of Education, Box 480, Jefferson City, Missouri
BOGIA, Thomas H.	Assistant, Elementary Education State Dep't. of Education, 225 West State Street, Trenton 25, N.J.
BRANT, Margaret (Miss)	Area Homemaking Supervisor, Court House Annex, Carlisle, Pa. 17013
BRINEGAR, Mary Beth (Miss)	Child Care Consultant, Missouri Dep't. of Public Welfare, Jefferson City, Missouri
COHEN, Eli E.	Executive Secretary, National Child Labor Committee, 145 E. 32nd Street, New York, N.Y. 10016
CONKLIN, Doris (Miss)	Area Homemaking Supervisor, Market and New Streets, West Chester, Pa.
DAVIS, George W.	Manpower Utilization Advisor, Division of Vocational and Technical Education, U.S. Office of Education, Washington, D.C.
GREENE, Shirley E. (Dr.)	Executive Secretary, Town & Country Church, 1720 Chouteau Avenue, United Church of Christ, St. Louis 3, Missouri
HOUSTOUN, Laurence	U.S. Dep't. of Labor, Consultant to the Task Force on Poverty, Washington, D.C.
INSKIP, George B.	Assistant County Superintendent, Adams County, 149 Carlisle Street, Gettysburg, Pennsylvania
JOHNSON, Orval G.	Delinquency Study Project, Southern Illinois University Edwardsville, Illinois
KARRAKER, Cyrus (Dr.)	President, Pennsylvania Citizens Committee on Migrant Labor 1137 Market Street, Lewisburg, Pa.

Participants
(continued)

LE ROY, Dan C.	Director, Indian Education, State Department of Public Instruction Bismark, North Dakota
MC CANNE, Roy	Consultant, Migratory Education State Department of Education Denver 2, Colorado
MC INTOSH, Jack	Coordinator, School Programs for Children of Migrant Parents, Texas Education Agency, Austin 11, Texas
POTTS, Alfred M., 2nd (Dr.)	Chairman, The Center for Cultural Studies, Adams State College Alamosa, Colorado 81101
RING, Robert M.	Director, Conservation Education State Department of Public Instruction, Emmerson Building, State Fair Grounds, Springfield, Ill.
ROBERSON, Thomas	Health Education Consultant, Migrant Health Bureau, Div. of Community Health Services, Bureau of Health Services, U.S.Dept. of Health Washington, D. C.
RUEF, Werner H.	Supervisor, Bureau of Elementary School Supervision, State Education Department, Albany 1, New York
STOCKBURGER, Cassandra (Miss)	Director, NCEMC, 145 E. 32nd Street, New York, New York 10016
TOSCANO, Fausto	Representative, Office of the Governor, Austin, Texas
WILLOUGHBY, Dike A.	Consultant, School Facilities, State Dept. of Public Instruction, Olympia Washington

Migrant Child STATUS RECORD

Colorado State Department of Education
Section on Education of Migratory Children
State Office Building
Denver, Colorado 80203

District _____

School _____

Period __/__/__ to __/__/__

Name _____ (M F) Birthdate __/__/__ Age ____ Verified? _____
Sex Mo Day Yr

Current Address _____
(Street - Camp - Farm - RD# (Town)

Date Enrolled: __/__/__ Days Present: ____ Days Absent: ____ Days Membership: _____

Date Withdrew: __/__/__ Reasons for Absences: _____

Normal Grade for Age _____ Actual Grade _____ Achvmnt Level: Reading ____ Arith. _____
(Note: Indicate school grade level)

Home Base Address _____
Number Street Town County State

Home Base School _____
Name Address Town State

Occupation of parents or guardians for previous 12 months:

Name	Type of Work	Town, County, State
Father		
Mother		

Teacher comments on health, behavior, etc. _____

Textbooks used and/or major skill work done:

Reading _____

English _____

Spelling _____

Penmanship _____

Arithmetic _____

Social Studies _____

Science _____

Other _____

Please record results of health examinations and standardized tests on the reverse side, giving name of test, date, and result.

IES-ME-5(1964)

SCHOOL REPORT

_____
(NAME OF SCHOOL DISTRICT; HOME BASE DISTRICT)

_____
(ADDRESS)

_____ 19 – 19 _____
(DATE SCHOOL STARTED & ENDED) (SCHOOL YEAR)

_____
(NAME OF SCHOOL PRINCIPAL)

Days Present in Migrant School ____; Equivalent in Regular School ____

Days Absent in Migrant School ____; Equivalent in Regular School ____

Shown below is the grade level achievement of this pupil based upon actual performance as determined by all available data, including teacher judgment.

Use of English: Oral _____, Written _____

Reading _____, Mathematics _____

_____
(READING SERIES USED – NAME OF TEXT)

_____
(PUBLISHER AND AUTHOR)

REPORT OF OTHER SCHOOLS ATTENDED SINCE WITHDRAWAL FROM HOME BASE DISTRICT

_____
(NAME OF SCHOOL DISTRICT)

_____
(ADDRESS)

_____
(NAME OF SCHOOL PRINCIPAL)

Days Present _____; Days Absent _____

Assigned to Grade: _____

Quality of Performance: _____

_____
(NAME OF SCHOOL DISTRICT)

_____
(ADDRESS)

_____
(NAME OF SCHOOL PRINCIPAL)

Days Present _____; Days Absent _____

Assigned to Grade: _____

Quality of Performance: _____

Please report any other data that would be helpful in the instruction of this pupil.

TEXAS MIGRANT PROJECT SCHOOLS

The Migrant School Project operates approximately six months, with the instruction and clock hours being the same as the regular nine-months school term. The school day is usually 8 hours, Monday through Friday; and a day in this special school is equivalent to 1¼ days in the regular nine-months school. Approximately 130 school days comprise the six-months term, and most holidays are eliminated.

Because of time spent in remedial work, the first priority is given to the teaching of English and extending the oral vocabulary of the child; the second to mathematics; and the third to social studies. Science, art, music, and physical education make up the remainder of the curriculum.

Language arts and mathematics are taught on a somewhat non-graded system. Regardless of the grade placement of the child, he begins at the level at which he can perform and moves to succeeding levels as he reaches an accepted standard of mastery. This level is in part determined by standardized tests or tests especially designed for this project.

The migration pattern varies among school districts, therefore the beginning and ending of the migrant schools vary among the districts. Each district schedules its six-months program at the time of year to accommodate the largest number of children for the longest period of time.

Comments:

UNIFORM WITHDRAWAL OR TRANSFER FORM

for Pupils in the

TEXAS MIGRATORY PROJECT SCHOOLS

_____
(NAME OF PUPIL)

_____ _____
(AGE) (GRADE)

_____ _____
(DATE OF BIRTH) (PLACE OF BIRTH)

_____
(NAME OF FATHER)

_____
(NAME OF MOTHER)

_____
(ADDRESS OF PARENTS)

This form is to be returned to the student upon his withdrawal in order for him to present it to other schools that he may attend.

Keep this form and present it to the next school entered.

Guarde esta forma y entréguesela a la próxima escuela.

STAFF* OF STATE DEPARTMENTS OF EDUCATION RESPONSIBLE FOR MIGRANT CHILDREN'S EDUCATION

State	Name	Title
ALABAMA State Department of Education Montgomery 4	Melissa Emory	Consultant, School Lunch and Special Services
ARIZONA State Department of Public Instruction State Capitol Building Phoenix 85007	Wes. A. Townsend,	Director, Elementary Educ.
ARKANSAS State Department of Education Little Rock 72201	Mrs. Merlin A. Moore	Coordinator of Economic Education
CALIFORNIA State Department of Education 721 Capitol Mall Sacramento 95814	Helen Heffernan	Chief, Bureau of Elementary Education
COLORADO State Department of Education State Office Building Denver 80203	Roy McCanne	Consultant, Migrant Education
CONNECTICUT State Department of Education Hartford 15	George R. Champlin,	Chief, Elementary and Secondary Education
DELAWARE State Department of Public Instruction Dover	H. B. King	Assistant State Superintendent
FLORIDA State Department of Education Tallahassee	Fred W. Turner	Director, Division of Instructional Services

GEORGIA State Department of Education 208 State Office Bldg. Atlanta 30303	Paul Wills	Coordinator of Federal Relations
IDAHO State Department of Education Room 205, Statehouse Boise	Ross E. Barney	Assistant State Superintendent of Public Instruction
ILLINOIS State Division of Conservation Education Emmerson Bldg. State Fairgrounds Springfield	Robert M. Ring	Director, Conservation Education
INDIANA State Department of Public Instruction 227 State House Indianapolis 46204	Edgar B. Smith	Assistant Superintendent for Instructional Services
IOWA State Department of Social Welfare State Office Building Des Moines 50319	Margaret Conlan	Consultant for Day Care and Nursery Education
KANSAS State Department of Public Instruction Topeka 66612	Maurice E. Cook	Consultant, Section of Elementary & Secondary School Accreditation
KENTUCKY State Department of Education Frankfort 40601	Harry M. Sparks	Superintendent of Public Instruction
LOUISIANA State Department of Education Baton Rouge 4	J.B. Robertson	Assistant Superintendent for Elementary & Secondary Education
MAINE State Department of Education Augusta	James L. Brown	Elementary Supervisor

MARYLAND State Department of Education 301 W. Preston Street Baltimore 21201	Paul E. Huffington	Director, Division of Instruction
MASSACHUSETTS State Department of Education 200 Newbury Street Boston 16	John T. Schomer, Jr.	Supervisor of Elementary Education
MICHIGAN State Department of Education 230 N. Grand Ave. Lansing 48902	Jack Rombouts	Chief, Adult & Higher Education
MINNESOTA State Department of Education St. Paul 1	Eugene Meyer	Elementary School Director
MISSISSIPPI State Department of Education P.O. Box 771 Jackson 39205	E. Harold Fisher	Supervisor, Elementary Education
MISSOURI State Department of Education Box 480 Jefferson City 65102	Homer E. Bolen	Director of Supervision
MONTANA State Department of Public Instruction State Capitol Helena 59601	Homer V. Loucks	Director of Instruc- tional Services
NEBRASKA State Department of Education State Capitol Lincoln 68509	Dr. LeRoy Ortgiesen	Assistant Commissioner Instructional Services
NEVADA State Department of Education Carson City 89701	James Petticord	Supervisor, Agricul- ture, Vocational-Tech- nical & Adult Educ.

NEW HAMPSHIRE State Department of Education Rm. 410, State House Annex Concord	John G. Economopoulos,	Director, Elementary School Services
NEW JERSEY State Department of Education 225 West State Street Trenton	Thomas H. Bogia	Director, Migrant Education Program
NEW MEXICO State Department of Education Santa Fe 87501	Mrs. Mildred Fitzpatrick,	Director, Elementary Education
NEW YORK State Department of Education Albany 12224	Werner H. Ruef	Supervisor of Elementary Education
NORTH CAROLINA State Department of Public Instruction Raleigh 27602	Nile F. Hunt	Director, Division of Instructional Services
NORTH DAKOTA State Department of Public Instruction Bismarck	Dan C. LeRoy	Director of Indian Education
OHIO State Department of Education Columbus	Phila Humphreys	Elementary Supervisor
OKLAHOMA State Department of Education Oklahoma City	E. H. McDonald	Assistant State Supervisor
OREGON State Department of Education Salem 97310	Oscar Schoemake	Consultant, Elementary Education
PENNSYLVANIA State Department of Public Instruction Harrisburg	Mrs. Clio S. Reinwald,	Coordinator, Family, Migrant and Nursing Education

RHODE ISLAND		
State Department of Education Providence 8	Michael F. Walsh	Commissioner of Education
SOUTH CAROLINA		
State Department of Education Columbia	Frances Hudgens	Supervisor, Elementary Education
SOUTH DAKOTA		
State Department of Public Instruction Pierre	Lowell Bell	Supervisor of Guidance
TENNESSEE		
State Department of Education 142 Cordell Hull Bldg. Nashville 3	Dr. E. B. Eller	Coordinator, Division of Instruction
TEXAS		
Texas Education Agency Austin 11	Jack McIntosh	Director, Migrant Project
UTAH		
State Department of Education Salt Lake City 84114	Dr. Quentin E. Utley,	Administrator, Div. of Elementary & Secondary Education
VERMONT		
State Department of Education Montpelier	Dr. Max W. Barrows	Director of Instruction
VIRGINIA		
State Department of Education Richmond 16	Julian M. Campbell	State Supervisor, Vocational Agriculture
WASHINGTON		
State Department of Education Old Capitol Building Olympia	Dike A. Willoughby	Consultant, School Facilities & Organization

WEST VIRGINIA		
State Department of Education Capitol Bldg. Rm. W-119 Charleston	R. Neil Chenoweth	State Supervisor of Elementary Schools
WISCONSIN		
State Department of Public Instruction Room 147 North, Capitol Madison 53702	Robert C.Van Raalte,	Assistant Superintendent
WYOMING		
State Department of Education Cheyenne	Dorris L. Sander	Director, Elementary Education

*Not necessarily designated personnel.

Prepared by

National Committee on the Education of Migrant Children
145 East 32nd Street
New York 16, N.Y.

9/64